

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/039,019	12/31/2001	Xiaowei Weng	56.0622	7528
27452	7590 10/01/2004		EXAMINER	
SCHLUMBERGER TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION			THOMPSON, KENNETH L	
IP DEPT., WELL STIMULATION 110 SCHLUMBERGER DRIVE, MD1 SUGAR LAND, TX 77478		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3672		

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/039,019	WENG ET AL.				
,	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kenn Thompson	3672				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 16 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe	void abandonment of this application to the same of th	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moterned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee efee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	I be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment				
The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u> .	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u> .					
Claim(s)_withdrawn-from-consideration:						
8. \square The drawing correction filed on is a) \square app						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	· / / .a .				
10. Other:		-1/1/26hugay				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Kenn Thompson Primary Patent Examiner Art Unit: 3672 Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues the frangible diaphragm disclosed by Huitt et al. is not a burst disk as described in the present application. The frangible diaphragm is inherently capable of performing as the a burst disk, the claimed structural limitations do not preclude the comparison.

Applicant argues the frangible diaphragm disclosed by Huitt et al. is not designed to burst at a specific pressure and fluid pressure is not used to burst the covering, but rather the bit itself. The claims do not require the burst disc to rupture from contact with fluid pressure. Applicant argues the casing (22) of Huitt, which isolates the wellbore from the formation and prevents fluid from flowing into the wellbore, is not comparable to the annulus isolation mechanism of Applicant's invention. The claims anticipated by Huitt et al. require only an annulus isolation mechanism, they do not recite structural limitations precluding the comparison.

Applicant argues the prior art of Huitt et al. does not disclose the apparatus being suitable for hydraulic fracturing, the apparatus is specifically for initiating fractures. The claims do not require hydraulic fracturing or fluid contact with the formation creating the fracture. Huitt et al. discloses use of a supplied fluid to fracture the formation.

Applicant argues the prior art of Huitt et al. does not disclose a mechanism that allows fluid to be placed through it. Huitt discloses in column 2 lines 24 and 25 tubing 25 is provided for injection of fluid.